

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application, as amended herein, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1 – 17, 19 and 20 are currently pending. Claims 2 – 9, 11 – 14, 19 and 20 have been indicated as allowable if rewritten to include the limitations of any claims from which they depend, for which the Applicants would like to thank the Examiner. Claims 1, 10 and 15 have been amended to more particularly set forth the claimed invention. Claim 16 has been cancelled. Claim 17 has been amended to depend from claim 15.

Currently claims 1, 10 and 15 – 18 stand rejected. More specifically, claims 1 and 10 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by each of Loseries, Kitai and Yoshizakai. Claims 15 – 18 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Naka. For the reasons set forth herein, Applicants respectfully traverse these rejections.

I. Independent Claims 1 and 10, as currently amended, are not anticipated by the cited references which each teaches the use of more than the claimed two blade portions to make up the shutter

Independent claims 1 and 10 have been amended herein to point out one feature of the presently claimed invention. As shown in Fig. 31, and claimed in claims 1 and 10, there is a single main shutter blade 394 and a single supporting shutter blade 395, which, in combination, cover said lens aperture opening. Support for this is found in the specification on page 19, ll. 7 – 10, which state:

“The shutter group is realized with one main blade 394 and one supporting blade 395. The main blade 394 has a reduced size that does not cover the entire optical opening 363 when the solenoid 382 is energized. Rather, the supporting blade 395 covers the remaining area as shown more particularly in Fig. 31.”

As also set forth in the claims, the main shutter blade covers a substantially greater percentage of said lens aperture opening than does said supporting shutter blade. Support for this is given in the specification, page 19, lines 15 – 17.

Among other features not present, none of the cited references teach or suggest the shutter configuration presently claimed. Rather, all of the references cited against claims 1 and 10 in the

Office Action are to shutters having more than the claimed single main blade and single supporting blade. For example, the Loseries patent (U.S. Patent No. 3,628,438) describes

“A swinging-sector camera shutter comprising a plurality of sectors. Each sector comprises a plurality of blades including a primary blade and a plurality of covering blades.” Abstract

Similarly, the Kitai patent (U.S. Patent No. 3,810,224) also discloses more than the claimed two blades. See Figs. 1, 2, 7 and 8. Additionally, the blades do not seem to be of the claimed proportions. There is no teaching or suggestion in Kitai to limit the invention from more than two blades to only two blades of the claimed proportions.

Likewise, the Yoshizaki patent (U.S. Patent No. 3,903,538) discloses a shutter comprised of a leading blade 8, and first and second trailing blades 12 and 13. This is described in Col. 5, 1. 55 – Col. 6, 1. 9, of the Yoshizaki patent.

None of the cited references teach or suggest Applicants' invention, as claimed in amended claims 1 and 10, and all claims depending therefrom. In fact, the teachings of the cited references would be destroyed if only two shutter blade portions were used.

As such, it is presently believed that claims 1 and 10, and all claims depending therefrom, are in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

II. Independent Claim 15, as currently amended, is not anticipated by the Naka reference, which teaches a differently configured switch gear than that of the claimed invention.

Independent claim 15 has been amended to include a number of the limitations set forth in claim 16, as well as a further clarification of that claim. Claim 16 has been cancelled. Claim 17 has been amended to depend from claim 15, instead of the now cancelled claim 16.

As currently set forth, independent claim 15 requires, among other limitations, that the switch actuator be directly captured by the projection on the switch gear that extends through the window. Support for this is found in Fig. 22 of the present application and described in the specification at page 10, lines 3 – 7. The Naka patent (U.S. Patent No. 6,629,901) cited in the Office Action does not include this feature. Rather, in the Naka patent, the power source dial 11 includes a protrusion 11b fitted into one end of a connecting member 44. It appears from figures

4 and 6, that only when the connecting member 44 is slid to the power on position (Fig. 6), is the connecting member 44 in contact with the switch contacts of switch 51. From Fig. 4, it can be seen that when the power source dial 11 is in the power off position, neither the dial 11, nor the connecting member 44, are in contact with any portion of the switch 51. As such, the Naka patent does not teach or suggest Applicants' currently claimed invention, wherein a portion of the switch gear directly captures the switch actuator.

As such, it is believed that independent claim 15, and its dependent claims 17 – 20 are in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

III. Conclusion

It can be seen from the above that the independent claims 1, 10 and 15, and the claims depending therefrom, can be distinguished from the references. As such, all claims are believed to be presently in condition for immediate allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 9, 2004



Kerry Sisselman
Reg. No. 37,237
Concord Camera Corp.
4000 Hollywood Blvd., Suite 650N
Hollywood, FL 33021
Telephone No.: (954) 331-4247
Facsimile No.: (954) 989-4103